

REMARKSI. Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated February 28, 2003, the specification has been amended. Additionally, the claims remain unchanged. Re-examination and re-consideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

II. Drawing Objections

In paragraph (1) of the Office Action, the drawings were objected to for including various reference signs there were not mentioned in the description. Applicants address each of these objections as follows:

Fig. 2 was objected to for reference 212. Applicants submit that reference 212 is described on page 53, line 13 of the specification. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of this objection.

Fig. 6 was objected to for reference 610. Applicants submit that reference 610 is described on page 55, line 20. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of this objection.

Fig. 8 was objected to for references 804 and 806. Applicants have amended the specification to include references 804 and 806. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this objection is now moot.

Fig. 11 was objected to for reference 1108. Applicants have amended the specification to include reference 1108. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this objection is now moot.

Applicants submit that in accordance with 37 CFR §1.121, the above-described amendments do not introduce new matter into the disclosure of the application.

III. Prior Art RejectionsA. Claim 1

In paragraph (10) of the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burrows and further in view of Wishnie as follows:

In considering claim 1,
Burrows et al. discloses an Internet web site, comprising:
an online service, implemented on a computer, for building, design, and construction personnel, wherein the files comprise drawings, documents, communications, and tasks related to the architectural projects (see Fig. 2, Design Tool Executables 37; col. 4, lines 5-15 and lines 33-40).

Additionally,

Wishnie et al. discloses an Internet web site comprising: an online service that provides an integrated project workspace for organizing folders therein as containers for storing, managing, and sharing files for one or more projects, and the integrated project workspace provides relevant content, services, and tools to help the personnel manage the files related to the projects (see Fig. 4a, hierarchical display space 402; col. 4, lines 23-38; Fig. 4, textual display space 404; col. 4, lines 39-49).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for one or more of the following reasons:

(1) Neither Burrows nor Wishnie teach, disclose, or suggest an integrated project workspace for organizing folders for one or more architectural projects; and

(2) Neither Burrows nor Wishnie teach, disclose, or suggest an integrated project workspace to help personnel (i.e., building, design, and construction personnel) manage files related to architectural projects.

Independent claim 1 provides for an online services for particular personnel – building, design, and construction personnel. The online service provides an integrated project workspace. The workspace is utilized for organizing folders as containers for storing, managing, and sharing files for architectural projects. The files further comprise drawings, documents, communications, and tasks related to the architectural projects. Additionally, the integrated project workspace provides relevant content, services, and tools to help the personnel (as described above) manage the files related to the architectural projects.

Burrows was utilized to teach some of the claim elements. Wishnie was utilized to teach the integrated project workspace claim elements. However, contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, Wishnie does not even remotely read on or teach these claim elements. Wishnie is specifically directed towards a file hierarchy for HTML files utilized to build a web site (see Title and Abstract). Fig. 4a of Wishnie (as described in col. 4, lines 22-50) provides a hierarchical display space 402 and textual display space 404 that illustrates a selected web site in a tree fashion showing the various pages of the web site. The entry in the hierarchical display space 402 has a point that points the HTML file for a particular entry. The textual display space 404 has a textual description of attributes for each page in the web site. Accordingly, Wishnie is directed towards organizing HTML files for a web site.

In view of the above, Wishnie's web site and methodology is not directed towards or utilized by building, design, and construction personnel as claimed. The claims specifically provide that the

integrated project workspace provides content, services, and tools to help such building, design, and construction personnel. Instead of being directed towards such particular personnel, Wishnie is directed towards personnel desiring to create and organize files for a web site.

Additionally, the integrated workspace is related to architectural projects. The Office Action simply omits the term "architectural" when rejecting the claims. In this regard, the Office Action merely uses the term "projects" when relying on Wishnie. However, this element provides a context for the web site and is specifically claimed. Wishnie is not even remotely related to architectural projects. Further, the term "architectural" cannot be removed from the claims since it is an integral part of this independent claim. Thus, regardless of whether Burrows provides for a distributed CAD system, Wishnie is wholly unrelated and cannot be utilized to teach the claimed elements. Specifically, the folders are utilized as containers relating to architectural projects. Neither Burrows nor Wishnie teach such a claim element. In this regard, Wishnie's mere hierarchical structure of HTML files completely fails to teach, disclose, or suggest, either expressly or implicitly, containers for storing, managing and sharing files for an architectural project.

Additionally, Wishnie's folders are utilized for HTML files and not projects. In fact, an electronic search for the term "project" in Wishnie provides no results at all. Without even using the word "project", Wishnie cannot possibly teach an integrated web site directed towards projects (and more particularly architectural projects).

In view of the above, Applicants submit that Independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

B. Claims 2-45

In paragraphs (2)-(3) of the Office Action, claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 43, and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Burrows et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,397,117 (Burrows). In paragraphs (4)-(5) of the Office Action, claims 4, 9, 15, 18, 23, 30, 33, 38, and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burrows et al. as applied to claims 2, 16, and 31, and further in view of Wishnie et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,148,311 (Wishnie). In paragraph (6) of the Office Action, claims 10, 11, 24, 25, 39, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burrows et al. as applied to claims 2, 16, and 31, and further in view of Lowell, U.S. Patent No. 6,381,632 (Lowell). In paragraph (7) of

the Office Action, claims 8, 22, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burrows et al as applied to claims 2, 16, and 31, and further in view of Robertson, U.S. Patent No. 6,269,369 (Robertson). In paragraph (8) of the Office Action, claims 12, 26, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burrows as applied to claims 2, 16, and 31, and further in view of Yasue, U.S. Patent No. 6,289,345 (Yasue). In paragraph (9) of the Office Action, claims 13, 27, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burrows as applied to claims 2, 16, and 31, and further in view of Burridge, U.S. Patent No. 6,430,567 (Burridge).

Specifically, independent claims 2, 16, and 31 were rejected as follows:

In considering claims 2, 16, and 31,
Burrows et al. discloses a computer-implemented apparatus, a method, and an article of manufacture, each comprising:
Accessing architectural project information using an interactive web site hosted on a server wherein one or more areas of the interactive web site provide for:
modification and organization of:
display of the interactive web site (see Fig. 2, Display 42: col. 4, lines 14-26);
site members of the interactive web site (see Fig. 3, Users 26);
one or more projects including storing, organizing, and displaying drawings and text files in project folders and standard folders (see Fig. 2, Design Tool Executables 37; col. 4, lines 5-15 and lines 33-40); and
project members of the one or more projects including defining access permissions for project members to access the project folders, the standard folders, the drawings, and the text files (see Fig. 4, Steps C1 and C2; col. 5, lines 16-20 and lines 58-69).

Applicants traverse the above rejections for one or more of the following reasons:

- (1) Burrows fails to teach, disclose or suggest an area of a web site that provides for the modification and organization of site members of the web site;
- (2) Burrows fails to teach, disclose or suggest projects including an area of a web site that provides for the modification and organization of projects including storing, organizing and displaying drawings and text files;
- (3) Burrows fails to teach, disclose or suggest folders including an area of a web site that provides for the modification and organization of projects in project folders and standard folders; and
- (4) Burrows fails to teach, disclose or suggest project members of one or more projects.

Independent claims 2, 16, and 31 are generally directed to accessing architectural project information using an interactive web site. The web site has various areas. One such area provides

for the modification and organization of site members of the web site. Another area provides for the modification and organization one or more projects including storing, organizing, and displaying drawings and text files in project folders and standard folders. Additionally, a third area provides for the modification and organization of project members of projects including defining access permissions for project members to access project folders, standard folders, drawings, and text files.

To teach each of the above elements, the Office Action relies on Burrows. Specifically, to teach an area of the web site that provides for the modification and organization of site members, the Office Action sites Burrows Fig. 3, users 26. However, item 26 of Fig. 3 merely illustrates a user connected to a network. Nowhere is there any description in Burrows (either within FIG. 3, the other figures, or the text) that allows for the organization and modification of site members. Further, nowhere in Burrows is there any reference to site members of a web site whatsoever. The use of Burrows' passwords in relation to the present claims is addressed in further detail below.

To teach an area of the web site for the modification and organization of one or more projects including storing, organizing, and displaying drawings and text files in project folders and standard folders, the Office Action relies on Burrows Fig. 2, design tool executables 37, col. 4, lines 5-15 and lines 33-40. Applicants note that an electronic search of Burrows for the term "project" provides no results. Without even mentioning the word "project", Burrows cannot possibly teach various claim elements that all utilize the word "project". Further, the use of design tool executables 37 does not even remotely suggest modifying and organizing projects in project folders and standard folders. Burrows' design tool executables are executable files used to perform a desired CAD task (see col. 5, lines 13-20; col. 5, lines 58-60; col. 6, lines 5-27). For example, to design an integrated circuit, a user may use a CAD tool with associated executable libraries that enable the designing of a memory cell for incorporation into an integrated circuit design (see col. 5, lines 13-20). In view of such an explanation by Burrows, the design tool 37 used to complete a CAD task does not teach or disclose, implicitly or explicitly, projects (or an area of a web site that provides for modification and organization of projects) that include storing, organizing, and displaying drawings and text files in project folders and standard folders.

In fact, Burrows fails to even teach the use of any folders. An electronic search for the term "folder" in Burrows provides no results. The claims specifically provide for both project folders and

standard folders and the organizing of projects and files within such folders. Burrows does not even remotely teach such folders or file/project organization.

In addition to the above, the Office Action relies on fig. 4, steps C1 and C2; col. 5, lines 16-20 and lines 58-69 to teach the claimed element of an area of the web site that provides for the modification and organization of project members of the one or more projects including defining access permissions for project members to access the project folders, the standard folders, the drawings, and the text files. As claimed, there is both a site members area and a project members area. Burrows merely provides for providing suitable security clearance (e.g. passwords) so that only authorized users gain access to a web page (see col. 5, lines 8-12). Thus, Burrows simply provides that access to a web page may be based on a password. However, Burrows fails to describe an area of a web site that provides for the modification and organization of site members and another area that provides for the modification and organization of project members. The mere use of passwords in determining if a user has access to a web page is completely different and distinguishable from organizing such users in an area of a web site.

In addition, Burrows describes that once a CAD task parameter form has been completed, security checks are performed, and subject to correct authorization, a job description is created (see col. 5, lines 58-62). However, contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, such a description fails to teach an area of a web site that provides for the modification and organization of project members of one or more projects. In this regard, Burrows fails to describe any area of a web site that provides the ability to organize and modify project members of one or more projects. The mere ability to perform a security check does teach a web site where access permissions may be defined on a project folder basis, standard folder basis, drawing basis, and/or text file basis (as claimed). Such a defining is completely lacking in Burrows.

The remaining cited references also fail to teach, disclose, or suggest these various elements of Applicants' independent claims.

Moreover, the various elements of Applicants' claimed invention together provide operational advantages over Burrows, Wishnie, Lowell, Robertson, Yasue, and Burridge. In addition, Applicants' invention solves problems not recognized by Burrows, Wishnie, Lowell, Robertson, Yasue, and Burridge.

Thus, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 2, 16, and 31 are allowable over Burrows, Wishnie, Lowell, Robertson, Yasue, and Burridge. Further, dependent claims 3-15, 17-30, and 32-45 are submitted to be allowable over Burrows, Wishnie, Lowell, Robertson, Yasue, and Burridge in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 1, 2, 16, and 31, respectively, and thus contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 3-15, 17-30, and 32-45 recite additional novel elements not shown by Burrows, Wishnie, Lowell, Robertson, Yasue, and Burridge.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

GATES & COOPER LLP
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date: May 28, 2003

By: Jason S. Feldmar
Name: Jason S. Feldmar
Reg. No.: 39,187

JSF/sjm